UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,715	09/15/2003	Gautam Dharamshi	34874-358/2003P00183US	9987

64280 7590 12/16/2008

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C.
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER
BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER	
MCLEOD, MARSHALL M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2457	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/662,715	DHARAMSHI, GAUTAM	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MARSHALL MCLEOD	2457	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 August 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office action has been issued in response to amendment filed 29 August 2008. Claims 1-29 are pending. Applicants' arguments have been carefully and respectfully considered in light of the instant amendment and are persuasive, as they relate to the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101. As such the examiner withdraws the 35 U.S.C. 101 claim rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claims 20, 23, 24, 25-27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Seshadri et al. (Patent No US 7,209,916 B1), hereinafter Seshadri.**

4. With respect to claim 20, Seshadri discloses a method of managing data conveyance between a data distribution device and a data output device (Column 6, lines 50-67; continued through to Column 7, lines 1-4), the method comprising:

determining whether a command to modify data conveyance rules is received (Column 10, lines 19-23; i.e. the From_Rule is modified…according to one or more incoming messages which means the only way a message is processed is if it is determined that one or more incoming messages were received);

if the command to modify has been received, sending a message to the data distribution device indicating that the data conveyance rules are to be modified including identification data for specifying the data conveyance rules that are to be modified (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17);

determining if a message specifying a user interface corresponding to the rule template and a parameter associated with the data conveyance rules that are to be modified has been received from the data distribution device (Column 10, lines 18-36);

if the message specifying the user interface has been received, generating the specified user interface (Column 10, lines 32-39);

determining whether a command indicating specification of the parameter has been received via the generated user interface (Column 10, lines 50-67);

if the command specifying the parameter has been received (Column 16, lines 1-3; i.e. …mail messages being received), sending a message comprising a specification of the parameter (Column 15, lines 65-67; i.e. the rule is applied to all mail messages whoever they are addressed to which are simply specifications of the parameter) to the data distribution device for changing the data conveyance rules (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17).

5. With respect to claims 23, 26 and 28, Seshadri discloses determining whether a message (Column 11, lines 42-45) specifying a user interface corresponding to a set of rule templates has been received (Column 10, lines 32-33);
if the message has been received, generating the user interface (Column 10, lines 32-39);
determining whether a command indicating that one of the templates in the set has been selected has been received (Column 9, lines 35-36; Column 9, lines 51-53; i.e. discloses that the determination is made upon the receipt of a triggering activity such as the receipt of an email, which causes the developer to fire the prior selected template.).
if the command has been received, sending a message indicating selection of one of the templates in the set (Column 9, lines 51-53; i.e. discloses that if email messages (i.e. commands) are received then instances of a rule template should fire which can be interpreted as sending a selected rule template).

6. With respect to claim 24, Seshadri discloses wherein the rule template comprises a rule template for one of the data conveyance rules (Column 9, lines 51-53).

With respect to claim 25, Seshadri discloses a system for managing data conveyance between a data distribution device and a data output device (Column 6, lines 50-67; continued through to Column 7, lines 1-4) comprising: a data output device (Column 6, lines 50-64; i.e. computer) comprising: a user input device operable to receive a user command (Column 6, lines 50-64); a user display device operable to present a user command (Column 6, lines 50-64; i.e. computer); a processor operable to perform (Column 6, lines 50-64) the steps of : determining whether a

command to modify data conveyance rules is received (Column 10, lines 19-23; i.e. the From_Rule is modified…according to one or more incoming messages which means the only way a message is processed is if it is determined that one or more incoming messages were received);

if the command to modify has been received, sending a message to the data distribution device indicating that the data conveyance rules are to be modified including identification data for specifying the data conveyance rules that are to be modified (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17);

determining if a message specifying a user interface corresponding to the rule template and a parameter associated with the data conveyance rules that are to be modified has been received from the data distribution device (Column 10, lines 18-36);

if the message specifying the user interface has been received, generating the specified user interface (Column 10, lines 32-39);

determining whether a command indicating specification of the parameter has been received via the generated user interface (Column 10, lines 50-67);

if the command specifying the parameter has been received (Column 16, lines 1-3; i.e. …mail messages being received), generating a message comprising a specification of the parameter (Column 15, lines 65-67; i.e. the rule is applied to all mail messages whoever they are addressed to which are simply specifications of the parameter).

7. With respect to claim 27, Seshadri discloses a machine readable storage medium having instructions which when executed by a machine cause the machine to perform operations

(Column 29, lines 48-51) of: determining whether a command to modify data conveyance rules is received (Column 10, lines 19-23; i.e. the From_Rule is modified…according to one or more incoming messages which means the only way a message is processed is if it is determined that one or more incoming messages were received);

if the command to modify has been received, sending a message to the data distribution device indicating that the data conveyance rules are to be modified including identification data for specifying the data conveyance rules that are to be modified (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17);

determining if a message specifying a user interface corresponding to the rule template and a parameter associated with the data conveyance rules that are to be modified has been received from the data distribution device (Column 10, lines 18-36);

if the message specifying the user interface has been received, generating the specified user interface (Column 10, lines 32-39);

determining whether a command indicating specification of the parameter has been received via the generated user interface (Column 10, lines 50-67);

if the command specifying the parameter has been received (Column 16, lines 1-3; i.e. …mail messages being received), sending a message comprising a specification of the parameter (Column 15, lines 65-67; i.e. the rule is applied to all mail messages whoever they are addressed to which are simply specifications of the parameter).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 1, 4-5, 7-9, 11, 14-16, 19-21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seshadri et al. (Patent No US 7,209,916 B1), hereinafter Seshadri, in view of Serrano-Morales et al. (Pub. No US 2002/0032688 A1), hereinafter Serrano-Morales.**

10. With respect to claim 1, Seshadri discloses a method performed at a data distribution device (Column 6, lines 43-49), the method comprising:

determining whether a message indicating that data conveyance rules are to be modified has been received (Column 10, lines 19-23; i.e. the From_Rule is modified…according to one or more incoming messages which means the only way a message is processed is if it is determined that one or more incoming messages were received);

if the message to modify has been received, identifying a rule template associated with the data conveyance rules based on an identification data (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17), the identified rule template comprising at least one parameter (Column 9, lines 60-64);

sending a message (Column 11, lines 42-45) specifying a user interface corresponding to the rule template and the parameter associated with the data conveyance rules that are to be modified (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17);
determining whether a message comprising a specification of the parameter has been received (Column 15, lines 63-67 continued through Column 16, lines 1-3; i.e. the set of data that has to be matched against the mail messages being received is simply the set which is also the parameter that must be matched (i.e. determined) for all messages received);

Seshadri does not disclose if the message specifying the parameter has been received, creating a rule by binding the rule template with the specified parameter. However, Serrano-Morales discloses that if the message specifying the parameter has been received, creating a rule by binding the rule template with the specified parameter (Page 2; [0029], lines 1-5).
It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Seshadri with the teachings of Serrano-Morales, in order to allow a user to implement received rules, rule changes and or instructions.

11. With respect to claim 4, 11 and 16, Seshadri discloses sending a message specifying a user interface corresponding to the set of rule templates (Column 10, lines 32-33); and determining whether a message indicating selection of one of the templates in the set has been received (Column 9, lines 35-36; Column 9, lines 51-53; i.e. discloses that the determination is made upon the receipt of a triggering activity such as the receipt of an email, which causes the developer to fire the prior selected template.).

Seshadri does not disclose identifying a set of rule templates associated with the data conveyance rules to be modified. However, Serrano-Morales discloses identifying a set of rule templates associated with the data conveyance rules to be modified (Page 1; [0009], lines 1-6).

12. With respect to claim 5, Seshadri discloses translating the rule into a rule engine format (Column7, lines 35-42).

13. With respect to claim 7, Seshadri discloses determining whether a message comprising a subscription request has been received (Column 18; lines 34-40); if a subscription request has been received, identifying data conveyance rules associated with the subscription request (Column 19; lines 10-13); and sending data in accordance with the identified rules (Column 19, lines 52-54).

14. With respect to claim 8, Seshadri discloses wherein the identified rules are associated with a user of a data output device (Figure 18. item 1840; Column 5, lines 29-34).

15. With respect to claims 9, 14 and 19, Seshadri discloses parsing the rule to identify specifications for parameters of the template (Column 17, lines 9-12); and sending a message specifying a user interface corresponding to the associated template, the identified parameters, and the identified specifications (Column 10, lines 27-33).

Seshadri does not disclose associating one of the data conveyance rules with a rule template. However, Serrano-Morales discloses associating one of the data conveyance rules with a rule template (Page 1; [0009], lines 1-6).

16. With respect to claim 15, Seshadri discloses a machine readable storage medium having instructions which when executed by a machine cause the machine to perform operations (Column 29, lines 48-51) of: determining whether a message indicating that data conveyance rules are to be modified has been received at a data distribution device (Column 10, lines 19-23; i.e. the From_Rule is modified…according to one or more incoming messages which means the only way a message is processed is if it is determined that one or more incoming messages were received);

if the message to modify has been received, identifying a rule template associated with the data conveyance rules based on an identification data (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17), the identified rule template comprising at least one parameter (Column 9, lines 60-64);

generating a message (Column 11, lines 42-45) specifying a user interface corresponding to the rule template and the parameter associated with the data conveyance rules that are to be modified (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17);

determining whether a message comprising a specification of the parameter has been received (Column 15, lines 63-67 continued through Column 16, lines 1-3; i.e. the set of data that has to be matched against the mail messages being received is simply the set which is also the parameter that must be matched (i.e. determined) for all messages received);

Seshadri does not disclose if the message specifying the parameter has been received, creating a rule by binding the rule template with the specified parameter. However, Serrano-Morales discloses if the message specifying the parameter has been received, creating a rule by binding the rule template with the specified parameter (Page 2; [0029], lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Seshadri with the teachings of Serrano-Morales, in order to allow a user to implement received rules, rule changes and or instructions.

17. With respect to claim 18, Seshadri discloses a machine readable storage medium having instructions which when executed by a machine cause the machine to perform operations (Column 29, lines 48-51) of: determining whether a message comprising a subscription request has been received (Column 4, lines 59-62), if a subscription request has been received (Column 5, lines 25-27), identifying data conveyance rules associated with the subscription request (Column 5, lines 46-53), and sending data in accordance with the identified rules (Column 5, lines 46-56).

18. **Claims 2, 3, 10, 12, 17, 21, 22 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seshadri, in view of Serrano-Morales and further in view of Abrari et al. (Pub. No US 2002/0120917 A1), hereinafter Abrari.**

19. With respect to claims 2 and 21, the combination of Seshadri and Serrano-Morales does not disclose wherein the user interface comprises a natural language description of a business function of a data conveyance rule created with the rule template.
However, Abrari discloses wherein the user interface comprises a natural language description of a business function of a data conveyance rule created with the rule template (Page 5, [0050], lines 1-9).
It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined teachings of Seshadri and Serrano-Morales with the teachings of Abrari, in order to define the business rules to users in plain and simple terms.

20. With respect to claims 3 and 22, the combination of Seshadri and Serrano-Morales does not disclose wherein the user interface comprises a natural language description of the parameters for the rule template.
However, Abrari discloses wherein the user interface comprises a natural language description of the parameters for the rule template (Page 5, [0050], lines 1-9).

21. With respect to claim 10, Seshadri discloses a system comprising: a data distribution device (Column 10, line 27; i.e. messaging server) comprising: memory operable to store (Column 27, line 25); and a processor (Column 6, lines 60-64; i.e. computer) operable to: determine whether a message indicating that a set of the data conveyance rules are to be modified has been received (Column 10, lines 19-23; i.e. the From_Rule is modified…according

to one or more incoming messages which means the only way a message is processed is if it is determined that one or more incoming messages were received);

if the message to modify has been received, identifying a rule template associated with the data conveyance rules based on an identification data (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17), the identified rule template comprising at least one parameter (Column 9, lines 60-64);

generate a message (Column 11, lines 42-45) specifying a user interface corresponding to the rule template and the parameter associated with the data conveyance rules that are to be modified (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17);

determine whether a message comprising a specification of the parameter has been received (Column 15, lines 63-67 continued through Column 16, lines 1-3; i.e. the set of data that has to be matched against the mail messages being received is simply the set which is also the parameter that must be matched (i.e. determined) for all messages received);

Seshadri does not disclose a repository comprising data conveyance rules and rule templates associated with the data conveyance rules and if the message has been received; creating a rule by binding the rule template with the specified parameter.

However, Serrano-Morales discloses a repository comprising data conveyance rules and rule templates associated with the data conveyance rules (Page 2; [0024], lines 11-14; [0025], lines 1-8; Figure 1A, item 108) and that if the message has been received, creating a rule by binding the rule template with the specified parameter (Page 2; [0029], lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Seshadri with the teachings of Serrano-Morales, in order to allow a user to implement received rules, rule changes and or instructions, quickly by implementing them from a rule database.

The combination of Seshadri and Serrano-Morales does not disclose a rule editor for modifying the data conveyance rules and the rule templates. However, Abrari discloses a rule editor for modifying the data conveyance rules and the rule templates (Page 4; [0047], lines 1-2; Figure 1, item 182).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined teachings of Seshadri and Serrano-Morales with the teachings of Abrari, in order to speed the implementation of new rules by allowing a user to create rules and make rule changes.

22. With respect to claim 12, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 10 above. In addition Abrari discloses wherein: the memory is further operable to store a rule translator (Page 3; [0038], lines 1-10; i.e. discloses a business intelligence server that manages rule components, such as a rule translator; all servers include memory for storing data, as clearly disclosed by Abrari); and the processor is further operable to translate the rule into a rule engine format (Page 3; [0038], lines 3-10).

23. With respect to claim 17, Seshadri discloses a machine readable storage medium having instructions which when executed by a machine cause the machine to perform operations (Column 29, lines 48-51).

Neither Seshadri, nor Serrano-Morales discloses translating the rule into a rule engine format.

However, Abrari discloses translating the rule into a rule engine format (Page 3; [0038], lines 3-10).

24. With respect to claim 29, Seshadri discloses a system comprising: a data output device (Column 6, lines 64-67; continued through to Column 7, lines 1-4; i.e. platform server reads on data output device) operable to:

determine whether a command indicating that data conveyance rules are to be modified has been received (Column 10, lines 19-23; i.e. the From_Rule is modified…according to one or more incoming messages which means the only way a message is processed is if it is determined that one or more incoming messages were received);

if the command has been received, send a message indicating that data conveyance rules are to be modified (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17);

determine if a message (Column 11, lines 42-45) specifying a user interface corresponding to the rule template and a parameter has been received (Column 10, lines 18-36); if the message has been received, generate the user interface (Column 10, lines 32-39), determine whether a command indicating that one of the templates in the set has been selected has been received (Column 9, lines 35-36; Column 9, lines 51-53; i.e. discloses that the determination is made upon

the receipt of a triggering activity such as the receipt of an email, which causes the developer to fire the prior selected template.).

if the command has been received, send a message indicating selection of one of the templates in the set (Column 9, lines 51-53; i.e. discloses that if email messages (i.e. commands) are received then instances of a rule template should fire which can be interpreted as sending a selected rule template), determine if a message (Column 11, lines 42-45) specifying a user interface corresponding to the selected rule template has been received (Column 10, lines 32-33),

if the message has been received, generating the user interface (Column 10, lines 32-39);

determine whether a command indicating specification of the parameter has been received (Column 15, lines 63-67 continued through Column 16, lines 1-3; i.e. the set of data that has to be matched against the mail messages being received is simply the set which is also the parameter that must be matched (i.e. determined) for all messages received);

if the command has been received (Column 16, lines 1-3; i.e. …mail messages being received), send a message comprising a specification of the parameter (Column 15, lines 65-67; i.e. the rule is applied to all mail messages whoever they are addressed to which are simply specifications of the parameter); and a data distribution device operable to:

determine whether the message indicating that data conveyance rules are to be modified has been received (Column 10, lines 19-23; i.e. the From_Rule is modified…according to one or more incoming messages which means the only way a message is processed is if it is determined that one or more incoming messages were received), send the message specifying a user interface corresponding to a set of rule templates (Column 10, lines 32-33), determine whether the message indicating selection of one of the templates in the set has been received (Column 9,

lines 35-36; Column 9, lines 51-53; i.e. discloses that the determination is made upon the receipt of a triggering activity such as the receipt of an email, which causes the developer to fire the prior selected template.), identify a parameter for the selected template (Column 10, lines 32-33), send the message specifying a user interface corresponding to the selected rule template and a parameter of the selected rule template (Column 10, lines 32-33), determine whether the message comprising a specification of the parameter has been received (Column 15, lines 63-67 continued through Column 16, lines 1-3; i.e. the set of data that has to be matched against the mail messages being received is simply the set which is also the parameter that must be matched (i.e. determined) for all messages received), determine whether a message comprising a subscription request has been received (Column 4, lines 59-62), if a subscription request has been received (Column 5, lines 25-27), identify data conveyance rules associated with the subscription request (Column 5, lines 46-53), and send data in accordance with the identified rules (Column 5, lines 46-56), translate the rule into a rule engine format (Column7, lines 35-42).

Seshadri does not disclose if the message has been received, identify a set of rule templates associated with the data conveyance rules to be modified, if the message has been received, create a rule by binding the rule template with the specified parameter.
However, Serrano-Morales discloses if the message has been received, identify a set of rule templates associated with the data conveyance rules to be modified (Page 1; [0009], lines 1-6) and if the message has been received, create a rule by binding the rule template with the specified parameter (Page 2; [0029], lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Seshadri with the teachings of Serrano-Morales, in order to allow a user to implement received rules, rule changes and or instructions.

The combination of Seshadri and Serrano-Morales does not disclose the user interface comprising natural language descriptions of business functions of data conveyance rules created with the templates, the user interface comprising a natural language description of the parameter.

However Abrari discloses the user interface comprising natural language descriptions of business functions of data conveyance rules created with the templates (Page 5, [0050], lines 1-9), the user interface comprising a natural language description of the parameter (Page 5, [0050], lines 1-9; i.e. once a natural language interface is created it obvious to make the parameters to the interface natural language as well).

25. **Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seshadri, in view of Serrano-Morales and further in view of Carlson et al. (Pub. No US 2003/0046282 A1), hereinafter Carlson.**

26. With respect to claim 6, the combination of Seshadri and Serrano-Morales does not disclose wherein the rule engine format comprises Jrules.

However, Carlson discloses wherein the rule engine format comprises Jrules (Page 12; [0110], lines 9-11).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined teachings of Seshadri and Serrano-Morales with the teachings of Carlson in order to dynamically define and modify mapping rules to customize the mapping process.

27. **Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seshadri, in view of Abrari.**

28. With respect to claim 13, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 10 above. In Addition Seshadri discloses the processor is further operable to: determine whether a message comprising a subscription request has been received (Column 4, lines 59-62), if a subscription request has been received (Column 5, lines 25-27), identify data conveyance rules associated with the subscription request (Column 5, lines 46-53), and send data in accordance with the identified rules (Column 5, lines 46-56).

Seshadri does not disclose wherein: the memory is further operable to store a rule engine. However Abrari discloses wherein: the memory is further operable to store a rule engine (Page 3; [0038], lines 1-10; i.e. discloses a business intelligence server that manages rule components, such as a rule translator; all servers include memory for storing data, as clearly disclosed by Abrari).

Response to Arguments

29. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARSHALL MCLEOD whose telephone number is (571)270-3808. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 6:30 a.m-4:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Marshall McLeod
Art Unit 2457
12/8/2008

/ARIO ETIENNE/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457